DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 984 JC 770 021

AUTHOR Abel, Emily K.
TITLE Invisible and Indispensable: Part-Time Teachers in California Community Colleges.
PUB DATE [76]
NOTE 58p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Employment Problems; *Job Satisfaction; *Junior Colleges; *Part Time Teachers; Questionnaires; *School Surveys; *Subemployment; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Qualifications; Teacher Salaries; *Teaching Conditions; Women Teachers; Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS California; Santa Monica College

ABSTRACT

Part-time instructors constitute a substantial proportion of the faculty at all levels of instruction. Community colleges in California are especially dependent on part-time instructors. Based on a survey of 243 (46%) part-time instructors at Santa Monica College, this study shows that most part-time instructors are committed to the profession of teaching but prohibited from full-time jobs by the employment crisis. Their qualifications compare well with those of full-time faculty and they invest a substantial amount of time in preparation for class. They depend on their small salary from the college for a large proportion of their total income; many support themselves by holding a number of part-time assignments at various educational institutions. Part-time instructors are aggrieved by their low salaries, lack of fringe benefits, and their low status. Most would accept a full-time job but half would prefer to remain part-time if their pay and status were improved. Part-time teachers are denied the opportunity to prove themselves and then penalized for failure to demonstrate their merit. Additionally, the disproportionate number of women on the part-time staff can be considered as an example of the discriminatory treatment of women in academia. The women are more qualified, invest more time in class preparation, and have fewer outside professional commitments. The survey instrument and tabulated responses are appended. (JDS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED132984

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

'Invisible and Indispensable:

Part-Time Teachers in California Community Colleges

Emily K. Abel
446 16th Street
Santa Monica, Ca. 90402

JC 770 021

Abstract

Part-time instructors constitute a substantial proportion of the faculty at all levels of higher education. Community colleges in California are especially dependent on part-time instructors.

Based on a survey of the large part-time staff at one community college, this study shows that most part-time instructors are committed to the profession of teaching but prohibited by the employment crisis from finding full-time jobs. Their qualifications compare well with those of full-time teachers and they invest a substantial amount of time in class preparation. They depend on their small salary from the college for a large proportion of their total income. Many support themselves by holding a number of part-time assignments at various educational institutions. They are aggrieved by their low salary, lack of fringe benefits and insecure status. Most would accept a full-time job but half would prefer to remain part time if their pay and status were improved.

At all levels of academia, part-time teachers are denied the opportunity to prove themselves and then penalized for failure to demonstrate their merit. Part-time employment at community colleges is structured in such a way that the involvement of hourly instructors in the life of the college is hindered, and the second-class status of part-time teachers then defended on the basis of their lesser commitment to the school. In fact,

Abstract

most part-time instructors desire further participation in campus affairs.

The disproportionate number of women on the part-time staff can be considered an example of the discriminatory treatment of women in academia. The women part-time instructors differ in background, motivation and expectations from the men. The women are more qualified, they invest more time in class preparation, they have fewer outside professional interests and they are angrier about their pay and conditions of employment.

Introduction

Part-time teachers constitute a substantial proportion of the faculty at all levels of higher education. Community colleges are especially dependent on part timers. These public, two-year colleges began to employ large numbers of part-time teachers during the 1960s in order to cope with the influx of students. The proportion of part-time faculty members increased even more sharply during the early 1970s (Lombardi, 1975:1); although the period of rapidly expanding enrollment was over, the employment of part timers continued to be viewed as a money-saving arrangement.[1]

In California, the faculty of the community college system consisted of 14,273 full-time instructors and 20,027 part-time instructors by 1975. Thus, 58 percent of the teachers were employed only on an hourly basis. In addition, 7,505, or 53 percent of the full-time staff, also taught at their own institutions on an overload basis. Altogether, 38 percent of the graded classes were taught by employees who were being paid an hourly salary. Furthermore, 4,394, or 90 percent of the instructors of adult education classes, were part timers (Brydon et al, 1976:5,13,14).

Although part-time instructors[2] constituted the majority of the faculty in almost every community college district in the state (Ross, 1975), these teachers were not considered regular members of the college staff. Lists of the faculty generally omitted the names of part-time instructors; most studies of community college faculty focussed on full-time instructors (e.g., Cohen, 1969; Frankel, 1973; Garrison, 1967; Gleazer, 1968, 1972;

Kelley and Wilbur, 1970; Medsker and Tillery, 1970; Phair, 1972).[3] The pay and conditions of part-time instructors reflected their low status. A part-time instructor is generally paid less than one half of the prorated salary of a full-time instructor and is denied all fringe benefits. Classified as "temporary employees," part-time instructors have no job security and are not entitled to due process hearings when they are dismissed (Lombardi, 1975:4). Thus, the institutions that claim to function as the democratizing agents in higher education are in fact run like profit-oriented businesses; they maintain a small staff of full-time workers and then, when business demands increase, hire supplementary part-time workers who can be paid at a lower rate and who can be dismissed at will.

I have taught for two years at Santa Monica College, a large community college in an affluent section of Los Angeles. This college demonstrates the economic advantages of employing a disproportionate number of part-time teachers. Table I shows that the part-time staff at this college grew rapidly during the academic years 1974-75 and 1975-76 when enrollment increased. [Place Table I here.] It can be seen that, between the fall of 1974 and the spring of 1976, the administration increased the number of part-time instructors by more than 200 percent but increased the number of full-time teachers by less than 10 percent. This was sound economic policy. During the academic year 1975-76, all part-time instructors were paid a salary of $14.75 for each classroom hour, regardless of prior teaching experience, educational

background or hours spent in preparation; like part-time instructors at most other academic institutions, they were denied fringe benefits. As a result, part-time instructors earned about 40 percent of the pro-rated salary of full-time teachers, despite the fact that they taught identical courses for which students received the same credit and for which the college district received the same amount of money from the state.[4]

We can estimate the amount the college saved by hiring such a large proportion of these inexpensive, part-time teachers in the following way. A part-time teacher earns almost $800. for teaching one course. Roughly half of the hourly instructors teach one course and the remainder teach two. We can thus estimate that during the fall semester of 1975, the total salaries paid to both part-time instructors and those full-timers who were teaching overload classes, was $739,200. Since this sum represented 40 percent of what a staff of full-time teachers would have earned for the same courses, the cost of hiring full-time teachers to replace the part-time staff would have been $1,948,000. During this one semester alone, the college thus saved $1,109,000. During the spring semester, the college paid the 664 part-time teachers and 91 "overloading" teachers a combined salary of $900,000 and saved $1,359,000. Thus, during the academic year 1975-76, the college saved a total of $2,467,000 as a result of the large differential between hourly and full-time salaries.[5] This represents a sizable sum for a college with a total yearly income of $13,108,906.[6]

Where has this money gone? Between September 1974 and September 1976, six new administrative positions were created, a number of faculty members were declared management and substantial salary in-

creases were granted to all administrators. As a result, the amount spent on administrators' salaries rose from $427,980 to $711,221, an increase of $283,241, or 66 percent.[7] A building program, including a new library, a new meeting room for the Board of Trustees and new offices for administrators, has absorbed additional funds. Despite demands from the part-time faculty for office space, no funds have been allocated for this purpose. Symbolically, a lounge formerly used by part-time teachers to prepare for class has been converted into an enlarged office for one administrator.

During the fall semester of 1975 I conducted a survey of the part-time staff at Santa Monica College. Two hundred and forty-three, or slightly more than 46 percent of the total part-time staff, returned the questionnaire which I placed in their campus mail boxes. A copy of the questionnaire is in the Appendix. Although all responses were anonymous, the respondents appear to have represented a broad sample of the part-time staff. Questionnaires were received from roughly 46 percent of the part-time members of each academic division.

It is important to obtain information about the background, motivation and aspirations of part-time teachers because community college administrators frequently justify their discriminatory treatment of this segment of their faculty in two ways. First, they claim that part-time instructors lack a substantial commitment to the institution. Second, they assert that these teachers do not need larger salaries. After all, the recurrent argument goes,

the typical part-time teacher is a real estate salesman who stops off at the college one night a week for the enjoyment of sharing his expertise with a few students. Underlying this statement are the assumptions that the average part-time faculty member is a man, that he invests virtually no time in class preparation, that he lacks the qualifications for a regular faculty appointment, that he holds a full-time job elsewhere, that he does not regard himself primarily as an educator, and that he is satisfied with his salary and working conditions. On the basis of my survey, I will show first, that structural obstacles hamper the participation of part-time teachers in the life of the college and, second, that the stereotype of the part-timer held by the administration is wrong on virtually all counts.

Commitment

At all levels of academia part-time teachers are denied the opportunity to prove themselves and then penalized for failure to demonstrate their merit. Thus, although part-timers at universities are rarely awarded research grants, they are refused promotion on the grounds that they do not publish the requisite amount (Tobias & Rumbarger, 1974: 128). Part-time instructors at community colleges are placed in a similar bind. Part-time employment at these institutions is structured in such a way that the involvement of hourly instructors in the life of the college is hindered, and the second-class status of part-time teachers then defended on the basis of their lesser commitment to the school.

Commitment and loyalty are vague terms which cannot be easily quantified. At a community college they appear to be measured by visibility on campus. Although part-time instructors are castigated for their lack of commitment, they are specifically denied the means by which commitment is usually shown. Part-time faculty members are rarely provided with their own offices where colleagues can observe them holding student conferences and preparing for class, nor are they paid for performing such functions. As the answers to question 14 show, less than 25 percent of the respondents to the survey stated that they had access to office space of any kind in which to meet with students and less than 20 percent had space in which to prepare for class. Similarly, large numbers of part-time instructors are not even invited to

tne department meetings where concern with the affairs of a school is customarily demonstrated nor, if invited, are they paid for the time spent attending such meetings. Less than half of the respondents indicated that they were ever invited to department meetings and many of these specified that they were referring to a special fifteen minute meeting limited to part-time teachers which was held only once a semester. This meeting has since been eliminated.

The time and location of many part-time teaching assignments further restrict part-time teachers' opportunity to participate in campus affairs. Half of the hourly instructors teach at night, and a third meet their classes at such off-campus locations as the high school, churches, and a satellite campus thirty miles away. Because almost all full-time instructors teach during the day at the main campus, the majority of part-time teachers have virtually no opportunity for contact with "regular" faculty members. Part-time teachers are thus excluded from the informal collegial activities where many important decisions and contacts are made.

Part-time faculty members also lack the seniority of the full-time staff. It has been noted that between the spring and the fall of 1975, the part-time staff at the college grew from 365 to 528. Because some new part-time teachers were undoubtedly hired to replace those who resigned at the end of the spring semester, at least one-third of the part-time faculty were new during the fall of 1975. This figure is corroborated

by the answers to question 2 of the survey. This question further shows that only 24, or less than 10 percent of the respondents, had been teaching at the college nine years or more. By contrast, only 25 new full-time teachers,or 14 percent of the full-time staff, were hired at the beginning of the academic year, 1975-76, and one half of the full-time staff had been at the college at least nine years.[8] The administration made virtually no attempt to encourage a sense of belonging among the large number of new part-time teachers. The college had no orientation program for new part-time instructors[9] and did not even distribute copies of the faculty handbook to part-timers. Most part-time teachers thus assumed their responsibilities without being informed of the basic philosophy or goals of the college.

The insecure status of part-time teachers also inhibits their desire to participate actively in campus affairs. A comparison of the instructor lists for the fall of 1975 and the fall of 1976 shows that 187 people--35 percent of the part-time staff teaching in the fall of 1975--were no longer employed at the college the following year. By comparison, only 7 full-time teachers, or just 4 percent of the full-time staff in the fall of 1975, left the college during the same period. Administrative policies were primarily responsible for the high attrition rate of part-time instructors. During the spring of 1976, the administration sent dismissal notices to 140 part-time teachers, claiming that an enrollment decline was anticipated. However, just before the following fall semester began, 67 new part-time instructors were hired. Some part-time instructors also left voluntarily, for reasons that are readily comprehensible. A group of teachers considered expendable by their employers will have few compunctions about resigning their jobs as soon as some-

thing better appears. Moreover, because part-time teachers receive no salary increment for experience, they have no economic incentive to remain. We can assume that if administrators were concerned about the high turn-over and its consequent effect on the "commitment" of their hourly instructors, they would take steps to ameliorate the conditions of part-time employment.

The lack of involvement of part-time teachers in college affairs can thus be attributed to a variety of factors inherent in the structure of part-time employment. Most part-time teachers have not chosen to abstain from collegial activities. In fact, 50 percent of the respondents to the survey specified as "important" or "very important" their feelings of being outsiders, their lack of participation in departmental affairs and their denial of compensation for holding office hours. Such responses indicate that, far from shunning extra-curricular responsibilities, many part-time teachers feel that they have been deprived of an essential aspect of teaching at an academic institution.

Preparation Time

Is there any way of determining whether part-time teachers have in fact made a substantial investment in their institutions? A number of researchers have found that part-time employees in various fields work harder and are more productive than their full-time counterparts. For example, a study of social workers employed on a half-time basis found that they handled 89 percent as many cases as the full-time social workers (Project on the Status and Education of Women, 1976:1). The same principle appears to hold true for part-time teachers in community colleges.

Comparisons of full-time and part-time work loads in community colleges usually stress the non-teaching responsibilities of full-time instructors, such as serving on campus committees and participating in departmental affairs. However, recent studies have shown that full-timers spend no more than 10 percent of their time performing duties from which part-time teachers have been exempted (Lombardi, 1974:1). On the other hand, hourly instructors appear to spend a disproportionate amount of time in class preparation. As the answers to question 21 show, 129, or just over one half of the respondents to the survey,claimed that they spend at least three hours preparing for each hour they teach.[10] It would be virtually impossible for full-time instructors, who are required to teach fifteen hours a week, to devote a comparable amount of time: they would have to spend 45 hours a week preparing their classes, and 60 hours either in the classroom or in course preparation. Those full-time instructors who teach additional courses on an overload basis (more than half the total) would have to spend

even more time. However, it is undoubtedly unnecessary for full-time teachers to work so hard, because they generally repeat the same course each semester. Part-time teachers rarely remain at the college as long as their full-time counterparts and they are thus less likely to reap the benefit of experience. One implication of the high turnover rate of part-time instructors is that each semester a new group of teachers must spend a large amount of time preparing their courses.

Because all hourly instructors are reimbursed only for actual class time, their lengthy preparation time represents unpaid labor. Alternatively, we could say that those individuals who spend at least three hours preparing a one-hour class for which they are paid $14.75 are actually working for a maximum salary of $3.68. The few instructors who prepare over five hours for each class are working at a rate that is beneath the minimum wage. One definition of committed instructors should include those teachers who invest a substantial amount of time in classes for which they are paid a pittance.

Qualifications

It is commonly asserted that hourly instructors are selected in a random or haphazard manner and are thus not as well qualified as the full-time faculty who have been subjected to the full scrutiny of the regular hiring process. However, the part-time faculty members at Santa Monica College are well qualified according to the two criteria for assessing merit at a community college, academic credentials, and prior teaching experience.

One hundred and seventy-seven, or 73 percent of the respondents to the survey, reported that they had taught before their appointment at the college. Moreover, the majority had taught at the levels that would be considered appropriate background for community college teachers. Ninety-two had taught in secondary schools and 100 in colleges. These figures support a central contention of this paper, namely that part-time teachers have made a substantial professional commitment to the field of education.

The minimum requirement for certification as a community college instructor in California is a master's degree, except for those in occupational programs. Table II shows that the majority of part-time faculty members who lack an M.A. teach in the business and vocational divisions. [Place Table II here.] Furthermore, 15, or 26 percent, of the hourly instructors who have not completed an M.A. degree teach more than one course, whereas 92, or 47 percent, of those instructors who have earned this academic credential teach two or more courses. In terms of work load then, those part-time instructors without an M.A. degree represent a small fraction of

all hourly instruction.

The percentage of the part-time staff who hold doctorates compares well with the record of the full-time faculty members.[11] Eighteen, or 7 percent, of the respondents had earned either a Ph.D. or equivalent and 23, or 9 percent, were enrolled in doctoral programs. By contrast, 13 percent of the full-time faculty had received a doctorate.[12]

Although many part-time teachers thus come to their jobs at the college with considerable training and experience, their pay reflects the administrators' assumption that they lack appropriate qualifications. Full-time teachers receive salary increases for teaching experience and for course work beyond the master's degree. All part-time instructors are paid at the same rate regardless of previous faculty appointments and educational attainments.

Outside Employment

The belief that the overwhelming majority of part-time teachers hold full-time jobs and that their primary professional interest lies outside the field of education is implicit in the stereotype of the part-time teacher as a moonlighting real-estate salesman. However, data from the survey contradict both assumptions.[13]

The average part-time teacher is neither as securely nor as profitably employed as the stereotypical real-estate salesman. Of the 233 people who answered the question concerning outside employment, 156, or 66 percent, stated that they held a job in addition to their part-time teaching position at Santa Monica College. However, of these 156 respondents, 48 stated that their only additional job was a part-time or substitute teaching position at another educational institution. Thus, altogether 125, or 54 percent, of the respondents either have no outside job at all or have only another marginal teaching position.[14]

The majority of part-time teachers, like the full-time staff, have made their primary professional commitment to education. An important question in the survey was the following: "Do you consider yourself primarily a teacher or educator?" Sixty-seven, or 73 percent,of the responsents answered affirmatively. Moreover, most of the other jobs held by members of the part-time faculty are teaching positions. Of the 108 part-timers who hold outside jobs other than part-time teaching, 44, or 40 percent, are full-time teachers at another educational institution. When we add

this number to the large group who either have no outside employment at all or hold only additional part-time teaching positions, we find that teaching constitutes the sole employment of a total of 169, or 73 percent of the part-time faculty.

This large proportion of part-time instructors with no employment outside the field of education can in turn be divided into two distinct groups: those who are fully employed at one school and those who commute between part-time jobs at various educational institutions. Seventy-five percent of the Santa Monica College part-time faculty with full-time teaching positions, or 18 percent of the total part-time staff, are high school teachers. This is the source from which a significant number of community college teachers throughout the nation traditionally have been recruited; in 1971, over one-third of all community college faculty had formerly taught in a secondary school (Cohen et al., 1971:180). Although precise figures are not available, it is known that a substantial proportion of the full-time staff at Santa Monica College began their careers as secondary school teachers.

Although secondary school teachers are familiar members on community college staffs, the large number of teachers who depend for their livelihood on part-time teaching at two or more educational institutions constitute a new and increasingly significant group. The existence of this group of teachers without any primary institutional affiliation is largely the result of the employment crisis in the field of education. Many teachers have found that their only means of pursuing their career in today's tight job market is to pick up whatever part-time teaching jobs are available (Scully, 1975:1). Even if they succeed in putting together a schedule

in which they teach a full-time load, they generally earn less than half the salary. Because the jobs are usually secured on a semester-to-semester basis, these itinerant teachers are almost constantly engaged in the process of job hunting. The costs of their jobs also include the expense and psychological strain of commuting between different campuses. Well-qualified and committed, they form a cheap labor reserve for the nation's post-secondary schools.

It has been seen that the community colleges are especially dependent on this pool of under-employed and under-paid teachers. Most hourly instructors with additional part-time assignments are teaching at other community colleges. A total of 53, or 22 percent of the respondents, are also on the part-time staffs of other community colleges.[15] This group of commuters illustrates in the extreme the dilemma of most part-time teachers, who are prevented from participating fully in any one college and then penalized for that lack of participation. It is frequently asserted that part-time instructors who commute between various community college campuses dash from each class and devote only minimal attention to any one course. However, as Table III shows, these commuters appear to be among the most "committed" part-timers. [Place Table III here.]

Commuters tend to spend more time preparing their classes than other part-time faculty members. Their desire for more involvement in the college is demonstrated by their greater distress at their inability to participate in departmental affairs and at their lack of compensation for holding office hours. It should also be noted that the structure of their

employment is the result of administrative policies, not of their own occupational choices. As we have seen, in some fields it has been virtually impossible to obtain a full-time teaching position but relatively easy to find a single course to teach. The dissatisfaction of the commuters with their job situation is demonstrated by the fact that 75 percent of them, as opposed to 25 percent of the rest of the part-time faculty, are looking for a full-time job at another educational institution. Not surprisingly, the hourly instructors who teach part-time at other community colleges are more aggrieved by their low salary and absence of fringe benefits than are other part-timers.

Income

The primary rationalization for the low salary of part-time teachers is that they do not need more money. A similar justification has been used to defend wage discrimination against female workers: women join the labor force for fun or self-fulfillment and their earnings are supplementary. Women have countered this familiar "pin-money" argument by claiming that it rests on a capricious application of socialism and a misapprehension of women's economic needs. In a capitalist economy, workers are paid according to the amount they work, not according to what they need (Tobias & Rumbarger, 1974:132). Moreover, the majority of women workers are motivated by economic necessity (Women's Bureau, 1974:1).

It should be noted that it is virtually impossible to rely totally on the salary from a part-time teaching position at Santa Monica College to support an individual, much less a family. The college has limited the teaching load of each part-time instructor to two courses; the maximum annual salary of a part-timer during the academic year 1975-76 was thus $3,200, a sum far beneath the poverty level in the nation.[16] A college administration that does not pay part-time employees a living wage cannot then justify a discriminatory salary on the ground that those teachers have other sources of income. Nevertheless, the answers to question 9 show that 73, or 32 percent, of the respondents, derive at least one half of their personal yearly income from their teaching positions

at the college. It could be argued that this is the only statistic we should consider to determine economic need; wages should be sufficient to allow every adult to be economically independent of other members of the household. Given the paltry part-time salary, it is to be expected that most hourly instructors who lack other jobs must be supported by someone else; and, in fact, as the answers to question 10 show, over half of the part-time teachers stated that less than 10 percent of their household income comes from their teaching job at the college. What is surprising is that as many as 25, or 10 percent, of the respondents claim that at least 50 percent of their household income comes from their college wage and that an additional 85, or 35 percent, of the respondents, estimated that they depend on the salary for between 11 and 49 percent of their total income.

Teaching Time

It has been seen that, in their academic qualifications, teaching experience and commitment to education as a career, the typical adjunct instructor closely resembles the "regular" contract teacher. However, the second-class status of part-timers is further justified by the argument that they teach only part-time, evening students, not the traditional, college-age student population.

It is not clear, however, what logic would dictate the assignment of part-time students to part-time instructors and of low status to the latter. Such a policy, in fact, runs counter to the rhetoric of community colleges, which characterizes these institutions as democratizing agents in higher education. The primary means by which community colleges further equality is through their policy of open enrollment. However, the important question is not whether groups in society previously excluded from higher education can gain admittance to a college, but what happens to them once they enroll. A college that relegates one group of students to poorly-paid instructors is not working to guarantee equal opportunity for its entire student body. Moreover, a number of recent studies have shown that an increasingly large proportion of the students who choose to enter the "open-door" of community colleges in the future will be the adult, part-time students who are currently assigned to hourly instructors (Cross, 1971; Gleazer, 1972; Medsker & Tillery, 1971).

Furthermore, there is no clear demarcation between full-time day students and part-time evening students, and part-time instructors are, in fact, responsible for both. Many of the day-time students

work at least 40 hours during the week. Conversely, some evening students are unemployed and simply find it more convenient to attend classes that meet after 7 p.m. Because a large proportion of the evening courses are identical to those offered during the day, large numbers of "day" students take part of their load during the evening.

Although virtually all evening instructors are part-timers, almost half of the part-time faculty teach during the day. In fact, the assignment of day-time classes to hourly instructors is a fairly recent practice at community colleges; it began when the percentage of part-time teachers started to accelerate. Table IV shows that the evening part-timers conform to the administrators' stereotype more closely than do their day-time counterparts. [Place Table IV here.] As a group, the day-time hourly instructors teach more classes both at this college and at other community colleges. On the other hand, a smaller percentage of the day part-timers hold any other jobs and, as a result, they tend to rely on their salary from the college for a larger percentage of their total income. A higher proportion of the part-timers in the occupational fields teach at night.[17]

Women

Women outnumber men on the part-time teaching staff at Santa Monica College. In fact, the percentage of women on the part-time faculty is almost twice that of women on the full-time teaching staff. Women constitute 27 percent of the full-time faculty and 53 percent of the part-time faculty at the college. Moreover, because women part-timers tend to teach more courses than the men, an even greater percentage of the actual class load is taught by women than these figures suggest.

The large proportion of women holding these part-time positions can be considered an example of the exploitation of women in academia life. We have seen that large numbers of hourly instructors have accepted marginal positions not from preference but rather because these jobs represent their only opportunity for pursuing a teaching career in a tight job market; discrimination against women throughout academia is a second reason why many part-time teachers have been forced to accept low-level, low-paying jobs.

It has frequently been pointed out that the proportion of women in any academic position is inversely related to the status of that position (e.g., Bernard, 1966:85; Davis, 1971:593; Epstein, 1971:2; Sandler, 1972:569). Status in academia is customarily measured in two ways: by the prestige of an institution and by academic rank. Women are found overwhelmingly in smaller, non-elite colleges and they are concentrated in the lower ranks. The institutional distribution of female college teachers in the nation as a whole forms a

pyramid; women constitute 14.8 percent of the faculty at the universities, 22.7 percent at four-year colleges and 26.5 percent at two-year colleges (Robinson, 1973:22). (The percentage of women on the full-time faculty at Santa Monica College thus approaches the national norm very closely.) An even steeper pyramid is found in the distribution of women among the faculty ranks, from the miniscule percentage of women among the full professors (9 percent), to the more respectable proportion of women among the lecturers (35 percent) (Hole & Levine, 1971:317). In community colleges, where academic rank has generally not been instituted, the primary distinction is between the full-time and part-time faculty. The large sex differential in academic achievement becomes glaringly apparent when we combine the two pyramids. Women constituted 4 percent of the full professors at the prestigious University of California in 1973 (Deckard, 1975:131); as we have seen, in the fall of 1975, they constituted 53 percent of the part-time teachers in at least one of the state's community colleges which is situated at the bottom of the academic hierarchy. A full professor at the university, teaching two courses each semester--and all but certain to be a man--earns roughly 8 times as much as a part-time teacher at a community college with the same teaching load--and more likely than not to be a woman.

The causes of the extreme disparity between the employment patterns of men and women in academia are currently the subject of a great deal of investigation and debate. Is discrimination by institutions of higher education against qualified women the only significant factor? What weight should be given to the ways in which women have been socialized to lower their own aspirations (e.g., Deckard, 1975:136-42; Roby, 1975:171-193)? Further research

is needed before we can answer such questions. Nevertheless, we can surmise that, if more women than men have been forced to accept part-time positions because their careers have been retarded, then the women part-time teachers will differ in expectations, motivation and attainments from their male colleagues. As Table V shows, data from the survey support this assumption. [Place Table V here.]

More women hourly instructors than male part-time teachers taught before joining the staff of the college. As we have seen, this is an important criterion by which community college faculty are evaluated. Women are also well qualified when assessed according to the second criterion, academic credentials. Fewer women than men lack the M.A. Because only 12 percent of all Ph.D. degrees are awarded to women (Roby, 1975:171), one would expect that 12 percent of those who both hold Ph.D. degrees and teach at Santa Monica College would be women. In fact, 38 percent of the Ph.D. holders among the part-time staff are women. Women at Santa Monica College are thus more highly qualified when compared with men than are women in the population at large.

Coming to their jobs with considerable experience and training behind them, women also invest more time in the college. As a group, the women claimed that they spend more time in class preparation than do the men and more women stated that they participated in departmental meetings. The much larger proportion of women who want to join a state teachers' association can be considered another example of their greater commitment.

The women part-timers also have fewer outside professional interests than do the men. A significantly higher proportion of

the female respondents considered themselves primarily educators. Fewer women hold other jobs and those jobs tend to be less lucrative, less secure and less prestigious than those held by the men. Of the 20 part-time teachers who stated that they were either major professionals or proprietors of large businesses, only 5 were women.[18] On the other hand, of those part-time teachers with outside employment, a much larger percentage of the women have only a marginal teaching position at another educational institution. Not surprisingly, women rely on their salary from the college for a much larger proportion of their total income.

People who invest a great deal of time in a job generally expect to receive appropriate rewards and recognition. The women part-time teachers are clearly angrier than the men about their pay and conditions of employment. Despite the common belief that all women have husbands to support them and to provide them with the security of medical insurance, a slightly larger percentage of women resent the low salary and a much larger percentage of women are dissatisfied with the lack of medical benefits. The comparatively large proportion of women who are concerned about the lack of a credit union undoubtedly stems from the difficulty all women experience obtaining credit. The desire of the women for even more involvement in the affairs of the school is demonstrated by their greater resentment at being treated like outsiders and at not being compensated for holding office hours.

Subject Matter Taught

The stereotype of the part-timer as a real-estate salesman who shares his knowledge of business practices with a group of students is ultimately inaccurate because only a small proportion of the hourly instructors teach business subjects. About 50 percent of all part-time teachers at Santa Monica College teach in the humanities/social science division, 15 percent in the math/sciences division, 5 percent in physical education, 12 percent in the business division and 17 percent in the vocational division.

Significant distinctions can be drawn between the part-timers on the basis of subject taught. See Table VI. [Place Table VI here.] Although instructors in the business and vocational division (hereafter aggregated as the occupational divisions) conform to the administrators' stereotype, liberal arts instructors (i.e., those in the humanities/social science division, in the math/science division and in physical education)[19] provide support for the portrait of the part-time teacher I have drawn.

In the selection of occupational instructors, relevant experience in the field is frequently considered at least as important as academic training (Lombardi, 1975:32). It has previously been noted that the academic credentials of these part-timers are considerably lower than those of hourly instructors in liberal arts; more occupational part-timers lack an M.A. and very few have accumulated credits beyond that degree.

Not surprisingly, far more occupational instructors have outside jobs and their jobs tend to be more lucrative. On the other hand, a significantly higher proportion of instructors in the liberal arts field teach part-time at other community colleges, perceive themselves

as teachers or educators, would accept a full-time teaching position at tne college, and rely on their salary from Santa Monica College for a significant proportion of their total income. As a result, they are more aggrieved by the low salary, lack of fringe benefits and poor working conditions.

Concerns

It has been seen that moonlighters represent only a small fraction of the part-time staff at Santa Monica College. Most part-time faculty members are well qualified, committed teachers whose careers have been blocked by the employment crisis in education.

One hundred and fifty-seven, or 71 percent, of the respondents stated that they would accept a full-time appointment at Santa Monica College. Despite the self-serving stereotype of the part-timer propounded by administrators, the primary difference between full-time and part-time instructors appears to be simply this: the latter entered the job market too late to obtain the type of jobs which the former are holding.

Seventy-one respondents, or nearly half of those who indicated that they would accept a full-time appointment, also stated that they would prefer to remain on a part-time basis if pay and status were improved. This is another critical statistic. First, it implies that many hourly instructors are more dissatisfied with their inferior pay and second-class status than they are with their reduced teaching loads as such. Second, a large number of community college administrators have expressed a determination to eliminate part-time jobs should adjunct faculty gain parity pay and fringe benefits. In other words, when it is no longer economical to hire part-time teachers, their positions will be abolished. It is important to recognize that such a policy would run counter to the wishes of part-time teachers.

The elimination of part-time positions would also undermine a movement currently underway throughout academia to regularize part-time employment so that part-timers receive all the perquisites of their full-time counterparts (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973:Appendix D; Robinson, 1973:226; Robias & Rumbarger, 1974:132-37). Although the impetus behind this movement has been the desire of women to remain professionally active during their child-rearing years, an increasing number of men have also expressed the wish for more flexible career patterns. Were the community colleges to retain their large part-time staffs and implement policies geared toward improving conditions of employment, these colleges could serve as models for other post-secondary institutions.

On the last page of the questionnaire the part-time faculty were asked to rate certain concerns as either "very important," "important," "slightly important" or "unimportant." Those considered either "very important" or "important" by at least half of the respondents are enumerated in Table VII.[20] [Place Table VII here.] It can be seen that the respondents were concerned first with their insecure status, second with their low salary, third with their lack of fringe benefits and fourth with their inability to participate more fully in the life of the college.

It is significant that the primary grievance was the lack of job security and tenure. We have noted that high turnover impedes the participation of part-time instructors in the life of the college

and that this is used by administrators to justify their treatment of the part-time staff. However, Table V shows that at least 70 percent of the respondents resented the fact that their continued employment at the college is so uncertain. Their concern was realistic; shortly after the survey was conducted, the administration fired 140 part-time teachers, claiming that an enrollment decline was projected.

The dissatisfaction with the low salary and lack of fringe benefits reflects the fact that the majority of part-time teachers are not fully employed and that they rely on their salary from the college for a significant portion of their total income. Finally, the desire of part-timers for greater involvement in the life of the college is demonstrated by the high rating they gave the lack of office space, the lack of compensation for holding office hours, the lack of participation in departmental affairs and their feeling of being outsiders.

Conclusion

The conditions of part-time employment in the community college system make apparent the emptiness of many of the promises held out by the expansion of this segment of higher education. The rhetoric of the community colleges presents them as democratizing agents, enabling the underprivileged to move upward through education. There are many reasons why these institutions have not been able to fulfill the ideal of redistributing educational privilege; all of the problems of the community colleges cannot be cured by raising the pay and status of part-time teachers. Nevertheless, as long as the majority of community college teachers are underpaid, discouraged from holding office hours and treated like second-class citizens, the education provided by the community colleges will continue to be stigmatized as inferior.

However, part-time teachers throughout California are beginning to organize and to demand equitable treatment. Part-time instructors in many community college districts have filed suit, charging that they have been misclassified as temporary employees and asking for re-employment as regular employees. Part-time instructors are also beginning to use the mechanism of collective bargaining to improve their conditions and pay. SB160, the Rhoda Act, which guarantees community college teachers the right of collective bargaining, stipulates that the bargaining unit must represent all classroom teachers and that it must be determined by all teachers voting equally. Given their superior numbers on virtually every campus in the state, part-time teachers potentially have the power to

decide the outcome of these elections.

The part-time faculty at most community colleges have been organized by representatives from the two union affiliates, the California Teachers Association and the American Federation of Teachers. However, at Santa Monica College, the part-time faculty had already organized themselves by the time these two groups recognized the advantages of including within their membership part-time instructors. Thus, the Santa Monica College part-time faculty association is one of the strongest organizations of part-time instructors because it resulted from a grass-roots movement. This association was founded during the summer of 1975. Like all marginal workers, part-time instructors are difficult to organize. Nevertheless, the part-time faculty association at the college had over 200 members by the spring of 1976. At this time the association became the CTA chapter on campus, despite a challenge from the full-time faculty. The association also conducted an authorization campaign to become the collective bargaining agent, obtaining the support of 57 percent of the entire faculty. Last summer, the association filed suit against the Board of Trustees, demanding the reinstatement of the 140 part-time instructors who had been arbitrarily dismissed the previous semester and asking for reclassification, pro-rata salary and back pay for all CTA members on campus.

Table I

Increases in Numbers of Students and Faculty*

	Fall,1974	Spring,1975	Fall,1975	Spring,1976
Total enrollment	14,750	16,095	17,814	18,157
Full-time teachers	155	155	170	170
Number of full-time teachers with "overload" classes	86	83	88	91
Number of part-time instructors	314	368	528	664

*Deputy Superintendent, Santa Monica Community College District, "Recommendation No. 2: Enrollment Comparisons, Fall 1973 through Spring 1976" (April 26, 1976)

Table II

Highest Academic Degree Obtained by Members of Different Departments*

Department	High School Diploma	A.A.	B.A.	M.A.	Doctoral Candidate	Ph.D. or Equivalent
Vocational	6	2	12	17	0	0
Business	0	1	8	15	3	3
Physical Education	0	0	3	9	0	0
Humanities/Social Sciences	1	0	3	91	17	10
Math/Sciences	0	0	7	20	3	3
Total	7	3	33	152	23	17

*Not all respondents indicated both their department and their highest degree obtained.

Table III

Additional Part-Time Teaching Assignments

	Percent teaching part-time at other community college (n-53)	Percent not teaching part-time at other community college (n-189)
Preparation time for each classroom hour:		
0-2 hours	37	48
3-5 hours	57	44
over 5 hours	6	8
Would accept full-time job at Santa Monica College	86	66
Looking for full-time job at other educational institution	73	25
Concerns considered either "important" or "very important"		
Lack of benefits:		
Medical	76	60
Dental	70	54
Inadequate salary	76	67
Lack of compensation for holding office hours	59	44
Lack of participation in departmental affairs	57	48
Lack of job security and tenure	83	68
Inability to move to full-time position	77	57
Second-class citizenship and feeling of being an outsider	60	48

Table IV

Teaching Time

	Percent Evening (n-132)	Day (n-103)
Teach only one course	65	47
Teach part-time at other community college	18	27
Teach full-time elsewhere	26	11
Hold other job	76	57
Percentage of yearly income derived from teaching position at college:		
Less than 10%	44	21
11-24%	25	17
25-49%	10	15
50-74%	9	13
75-99%	6	13
100%	6	21
Academic Division:		
Vocational	18	14
Business	19	6
Physical Education	6	4
Humanities/Social Sciences	45	60
Math/Sciences	12	16

Table V

Sex

	Percent Men (n-108)	Percent Women (n-121)
Teach only one course at Santa Monica College	65	48
Hold job in addition to teaching position at college	76	57
Eitner hold no other job or have only another part-time teaching position	46	70
Percentage of yearly income derived from teaching position at college:		
Less than 10%	53	18
11-24%	23	20
25-49%	8	17
50-74%	4	13
75-99%	7	12
100%	7	20
Preparation time for each classroom hour:		
0-2 hours	59	33
3-5 hours	36	55
over 5 hours	5	12
Highest academic degree:		
B.A. or lower	25	14
M.A.	53	74
Enrolled in doctoral program	13	7
Ph.D. or equivalent	9	5
Prior teaching experience	66	79
Consider selves primarily teachers or educators	63	86
Want to belong to State Teachers Association (if not currently a member)	25	68
Concerns considered "important" or "very important":		
Inadequate salary	67	70
Lack of fringe benefits:		
Medical	57	70
Dental	52	64
Credit Union	26	37

(continued)

Table V (continued)

	Percent Men (n-108)	Percent Women (n-121)
Severence Pay	37	44
Sick Leave	55	65
Child Care	9	28
Lack of office space	44	52
Lack of participation in departmental affairs	46	55
Lack of compensation for holding office hours	39	61
Lack of job security and tenure	63	80
Insufficient number of classes assigned	39	59
Second-class citizenship and feeling of being an outsider	42	60

Table VI

Subject Matter Taught

	Percent in Vocational Division (n-38)	Percent in Business Division (n-30)	Percent in Phys. Ed. Division (n-13)	Percent in Humanities/ Social Sciences (n-124)	Percent in Math/ Sciences (n-33)
Teach only one course	79	83	15	41	79
Teach part-time at other community college	11	17	15	26	30
Hold outside job	81	79	77	57	72
Women	47	29	58	65	29
Percentage of yearly income derived from teaching position at college:					
Less than 10%	54	64	--	22	36
11-24%	17	20	37	21	29
25-49%	3	3	9	14	19
50-74%	14	3	18	13	3
75-99%	9	3	27	11	3
100%	3	7	9	19	10
Highest academic degree:					
B.A. or lower	53	30	25	3	20
M.A.	45	50	75	75	60
Enrolled in doctoral program	--	10	--	14	10
Ph.D. or equivalent	2	10	--	8	10
Consider selves primarily teachers or educators	53	45	90	85	90
Would accept full-time job at college	56	46	83	79	80
Concerns considered "important" or "very important":					
Inadequate salary	61	63	85	73	67
Lack of fringe benefits:					
Medical	55	60	85	68	58
Dental	53	57	69	61	52
Retirement	53	47	77	56	42
Credit Union	37	33	62	30	18
Sick Leave	68	37	77	64	52
Lack of office space	47	30	39	51	58
Lack of participation in departmental affairs	32	40	69	57	52

(continued)

Table VI (continued)

	Percent in Vocational Division (n-38)	Percent in Business Division (n-30)	Percent in Phys. Ed. Division (n-13)	Percent in Humanities/ Social Sciences (n-124)	Percent in Math/ Sciences (n-33)
Lack of compensation for holding office hours	42	30	62	58	55
Lack of job security	64	53	85	77	70
Inability to move to full-time position	42	50	77	72	58
Insufficient number of classes assigned	40	37	77	55	43
Second-class citizenship and feeling of being an outsider	45	37	46	60	49

Table VII

Concerns Considered "Important" or "Very Important" to at Least 50 Percent of the Respondents

Item	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Lack of job security and tenure	172	70
Inadequate pay	167	65
Lack of medical benefits	155	64
Lack of sick leave	148	61
Inability to move to a full-time position	146	60
Lack of dental benefits	140	58
Lack of retirement benefits	128	53
Second-class citizenship and feeling of being an outsider	123	51
Lack of compensation for holding office hours	123	51
Lack of participation in departmental affairs	122	50

Appendix

Santa Monica Part-Time Teacher's Association

SURVEY

Dear Part Time Instructor:

The following questionnaire has been prepared by the Santa Monica College Part Time Teachers' Association. Our aim is to find out who we part-time faculty members are and what we want in order that our association can better serve our needs. We know that you are busy and that teaching at the college may be only one of your many obligations. We therefore appreciate the time and effort required to fill out this questionnaire. Please answer as many questions as you can.

All information you furnish will be held in strict confidence. Only members of the executive committee of the Part Time Teachers' Association will have access to the completed questionnaire. A summary of the results of this survey will be published and distributed to all part-time instructors. No individual names will be used.

Please place the completed form in the box provided in the faculty mail room or mail it to: Emily Abel, Box 336, by January 23.

Thank you for your help.

Emily Abel
Chairperson, Questionnaire Committee
Box 336

---

1. Sex

121 Female 108 Male

2. What is the total number of years you have taught at Santa Monica College (including this year)?

81 Less than one	22 Three	10 Six	24 Nine and over
23 One	17 Four	1 Seven	Ten
50 Two	8 Five	7 Eight	~~over ten~~

3. How many courses are you teaching at Santa Monica College this semester?

138 One	5 Four	Seven
88 Two	1 Five	Eight
11 Three	Six	

4. Are you also teaching part time at any other community college this semester?

53 Yes 189 No

If yes, note the number of classes you are teaching elsewhere

15 One	2 Four	0 Seven
21 Two	4 Five	0 Eight
9 Three	0 Six	0 Nine or more

5. Are you also teaching full time at Santa Monica College?

0 Yes 243 No

6. Are you teaching full time at another educational institution?

44 Yes 189 No

If yes, indicate the level(s) at which you are teaching:

1 Pre-school	4 Community college
2 Elementary school	3 University/four year college
33 Secondary school	1 Adult education

7. Are you teaching part time at another educational institution?

84 Yes 148 No

If yes, indicate the level(s) at which you are teaching:

__ Pre-school
__ Elementary school
__ Secondary school
__ Community college
__ University/four year college
__ Adult education

8. Do you hold any other job in addition to your teaching position at Santa Monica College?

156 Yes 77 No

If yes, what do you do? _____

_____

9. Approximately what percentage of your personal yearly income comes from your part-time teaching position at Santa Monica College?

76 less than 10%
49 11-24%
27 25-49%
24 50-74%
20 75-99%
29 100%

10. Approximately what percentage of the yearly income of your household comes from your part-time teaching position at Santa Monica College?

117 less than 10%
53 11-24%
32 25-49%
13 50-74%
7 75-99%
5 100%

11. What course(s) are you teaching on a part-time basis at Santa Monica College this semester? (Indicate whether each is a credit or non-credit course.)

_____

_____

_____

In which department(s) is(are) your course(s) listed?

20 Art
21 Behavioral Sciences
30 Business Administration
7 Earth Sciences
34 English
14 Foreign Language
13 Home Economics
7 Life Sciences
18 Mathematics
7 Music
4 Nursing
4 Physical Education, Men
9 Physical Education, Women
3 Physical Science
24 Social Studies
4 Speech, Theatre Arts
15 Technical
9 Trade

12. When do the class(es) you teach on a part-time basis meet? (Check all appropriate)

157 a.m. - 9a.m.
259 a.m. - 12p.m.
2112p.m.-3p.m.
293p.m. - 6p.m.
1326p.m. - 10p.m.
13 Saturday morning
__ other (specify)_____

13. At which campus(es) do the class(es) you are teaching on a part-time basis meet? (Check all appropriate.)

140 Santa Monica College
10 Malibu
33 Santa Monica High School
10 John Adams Junior High
2 Edison Elementary School
2 Webster Elementary School
1 Grant Elementary School
12 other (specify)_____

14. Do you at present have access to office space to:

a. meet with students or teachers? 55 Yes 181 No
b. prepare for class? 42 Yes 185 No
c. leave books? 59 Yes 169 No

15. Are you invited to departmental meetings?
111 Yes 121 No

16. Do you participate in departmental meetings?
74 Yes 158 No

17. Do you participate in committees on campus?
12 Yes 230 No

18. Can you choose the courses you teach?
38 Yes 100 No 98 Limited choice

19. Can you choose your hours for teaching?
35 Yes 116 No 88 Limited choice

20. Do you belong to a state teachers' organization?
76 Yes 163 No

If no, do you want to belong to such an organization?
64 Yes 56 No

21. About how many hours do you prepare for each class hour you teach?
109 None - two 110 Three - five 19 Over five

22. What is the highest academic degree you hold?

7 High School Diploma
5 Associate of Arts or Science Degree
34 Bachelors
154 Masters
23 Candidate for a doctoral degree
18 Doctorate (include Ph.D., Ed.D., J.D., M.D.)
__ other (specify)_____

23. Did you teach prior to your appointment at Santa Monica College?
177 Yes 64 No

If yes, answer the following:

At what level(s) had you taught?	Indicate the number of years you taught at each level		Indicate whether each job was part time or full time	
Primary school	29	.....	__f.t.	__p.t.
Secondary school	92	.....	__f.t.	__p.t.
College	100	.....	__f.t.	__p.t.
Adult education	47	.....	__f.t.	__p.t.

24. Do you consider yourself primarily a teacher or educator?
67 Yes 23 No

25. Would you accept a full-time teaching position at Santa Monica College if one were offered to you?
157 Yes 65 No

If no, why not? _____

_____

_____

_____

26. Are you looking for a full-time job at another educational institution?
85 Yes 152 No

27. If your status and pay were improved, would you prefer to remain a part-time instructor?
141 Yes 77 No

28. What are your major concerns as a part-time faculty member at Santa Monica College? Indicate the importance of each item by checking the appropriate box:

	very important	important	slightly important	unimportant irrelevant
Inadequate salary	102	65	17	10
Lack of fringe benefits:				
Medical	112	43	24	32
Dental	98	42	31	32
Retirement	83	45	29	35
Credit Union	40	37	42	59
Severance pay	50	47	42	46
Sick leave	88	60	24	26
Child care	20	24	20	102
Lack of office space	53	63	48	41
Lack of participation in departmental activities (selection of textbooks, appointment to committees, selection of faculty, etc.)	50	72	49	33
Lack of compensation for holding office hours	57	66	47	40
Insufficient choice in selecting teaching time	36	80	50	46
Insufficient choice of subject or courses taught	49	55	48	47
Lack of job security and tenure	136	36	22	27
Lack of opportunity to move to a full-time position	113	36	25	44
Insufficient number of classes assigned each semester	75	44	29	55
Inadequate facilities at off-campus locations	35	30	28	92
"Second-class" citizenship and feeling of being an outsider	81	42	31	56
Other				

.....

Thank you for taking the time to answer this questionnaire. If you wish to make any additional comments, please use this space.

Notes

1. Some administrators candidly admit that they frequently hire part-time teachers, even when full-time positions are available, as a way of saving money (Martes, 1975:5; Phair, 1972:2). The chancellor of one community college district stated (Peralta Fact Sheet, 1975, quoted in Marsh & Lamb, 1975:7):

> To a considerable extent, the use of part-time faculty has made possible the salary increases granted full and part-time employees in the recent past, has funded the district's sabbatical leave program and has averted a financial crisis in the district of unmanageable proportions.

A similar statement was made by the State Board for Community College Education in Washington (quoted in Marsh & Lamb, 1975: 19):

> To a large extent, economic conditions ... have forced colleges to depend upon the availability of part-time personnel as they sought to spread close-end budgets across an increasing demand for services. As a result, what has been viewed as exploitation of part-time personnel by some, might as easily be termed efficient management of finite resources by others.

2. Unless otherwise noted, this term refers only to those instructors who are employed solely on a part-time basis and does not include full-time instructors teaching additional courses on an overload basis at their own institution.

3. Studies of part-time instructors include Bender & Breuder, 1973; Kuhns, 1971; Lombardi, 1975; Ross, 1975. In addition, a number of faculty associations at individual colleges have produced valuable reports (e.g., Ferris, 1976; Marsh & Lamb, 1976; Office of Educational Services, Peralta, 1974; Rio Hondo Academic Senate, 1975).

4. Additional money is saved because part-timers are not assigned offices and because they receive no secretarial assistance; in fact, during the fall of 1976, the college abruptly terminated the practice of employing a few students to type exams for part-time teachers.

5. Summer school salaries are not included in these calculations. A large number of part-time instructors teach courses during the summer, for which they are paid at the hourly rate. On the other hand, full-time instructors receive the prorated full-time wage for their summer school assignments although they have no additional responsibilities.

6. Figure supplied by Assistant Superintendent James Fugle at a meeting of the Santa Monica College Faculty Senate, November 4, 1976.

7. Santa Monica College Unified Faculty Association, "Newsletter," II,2 (November 1976). The salary of the average administrator at the college is about 10 times the yearly salary of a part-time instructor teaching the full part-time load.

8. Information supplied by Office of Personnel, Santa Monica Community College District.

9. Santa Monica College is not unusual in its absence of any formal orientation program for part-time teachers. Lombardi found that part-time teachers in community colleges throughout the nation rarely receive more than one or two hours of advice from department chairmen before beginning to teach (1975:47; see also Bender & Breuder, 1973:34).

10. It is unfortunate that respondents were not asked to specify the exact number of hours they invested in each class; the first category, zero to two hours, was clearly too broad. Significantly, 22, or just over one-fifth of all respondents who checked this answer, took the trouble to indicate in some way that they spent two hours on class preparation.

11. Again, Santa Monica College is not unusual. One study of part-time community college instructors concluded that the "average adjunct faculty member has had a variety of educational experience together with an educational background nearly equivalent to that of the typical full-time faculty members" (Bender & Breuder, 1973: 34).

12. Figure supplied by Terrence C. Marre, in speech before the Board of Trustee, Santa Monica Community College District, June 21, 1976. Nationwide, only 7 percent of all community college faculty hold a doctorate (Cohen et al., 1971:33).

13. Administrators frequently base their assertions about the outside employment of their part-time staff on a survey conducted in 1975 by the California Community and Junior College Association, which appeared to demonstrate that 77.3 percent of the part-time instructors in California's community colleges hold full-time jobs (Brydon et al., 1975). However, this figure seems virtually meaningless for a number of reasons. First, the sample included those individuals who are employed full-time at a community college and who teach additional courses at the same campus on an overload basis; by definition, this group is fully employed. Since it constitutes 27 percent of the part-time faculty in the community college system, the CCJA study can only be asserting that half of all part-time teachers hold full-time jobs. More seriously, the CCJA results were obtained by asking administrators to "estimate" the proportion of their part-time faculty employed in different capacities. Because there is rarely any contact between administrators and part-time instructors, it is unlikely that the administrators have any information at all on which to base their estimates. Inaccuracies of computation further diminish the usefulness of the result of the CCJA survey. For example, on page 8, the numbers of part-time teachers employed in different capacities, do not add up to the stated total. Moreover, these numbers were extrapolated from the data received.

14. A survey conducted by the administration in the fall of 1976 to ascertain the employment patterns of part-time faculty similarly found that slightly over half of the part-timers either have no other job or hold only another part-time teaching position at another school.

15. It should be noted that not all members of this group are necessarily dependent on part-time teaching positions for their entire income.

16. The administration of a community college in Virginia which conducted a survey concluded that the part-time faculty did not rely on their income from their teaching jobs at the college because only a few people stated that their primary reason for teaching at the college was to support their families (Grymes, 1976:37). Since it is impossible to support a family from this salary, it is clear that no one could work in order to do so. It does not follow, however, that the salary of part-time teachers represents only supplemental income.

17. It is true that some part-time instructors teach both day and evening classes, but this does not appear to affect the general outcome.

18. The respondents who held other jobs were asked to specify the nature of their employment. Below is a list of these jobs classified according to the Hollingshead Occupational and Educational Scales (1958). Part-time teaching positions at other educational institutions are not included.

(continued)

Occupation	Number of Part-Time Teachers
Major professionals (e.g., physicians, architects, attorneys, university professors)	15
Business managers in large concerns	5
Lesser professionals (e.g., social workers, nurses, librarians, elementary and high school teachers)	40
Administrative personnel	5
Small business owners	2
Semi-professionals (e.g., actors, reporters)	17
Clerical and sales workers	7
Skilled and manual employees	5
Semi-skilled employees	2
Self-employed	6
Total	104

19. Physical education has arbitrarily been placed in the liberal arts division because the respondents from this department appeared to share more characteristics with the part-time liberal arts instructors than with the part-time instructors in the occupational field.

20. Surveys returned with blank answers to any items were counted as if they had ranked the item "unimportant." This undoubtedly gave undue weight to the unconcerned, because many people simply neglected to take the trouble to answer all or part of this lengthy question. In fact, it appears that many people did not notice the first item--inadequate salary--because it was placed immediately beneath the instructions.

References

Bender, L.W. and R.L. Breuder (1973) "Part-Time Teachers - 'Step-Children' of the Community College." I,1 Community College Review, 29-37.

Bernard, Jessie (1966) Academic Women. New York: Meridian.

Brydon, Charles W., William D. Plosser and Donald H. Sewell (1976) "Report on a Statewide Survey about Part-Time Faculty in California Community Colleges." Sacramento, California: California Community and Junior College Association.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1973) Opportunities for Women in Higher Education: Their Current Participation. Prospects for the Future and Recommendation for Action. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cohen, Arthur M. (1969) Dateline '79: Heretical Concepts for the Community College. Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press.

---------- with Florence B. Brawer and John Lombardi (1971) A Constant Variable: New Perspectives on the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cross, K. Patricia (1971) Beyond the Open Door. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Davis, Ann E. (1971) "Women as a Minority Group in Higher Academics." In The Professional Woman, edited by Athena Theodore. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co.

Deckard, Barbara (1975) The Women's Movement: Political, Socioeconomic and Psychological Issues. New York: Harper and Row.

Epstein, Cynthia Fuchs (1971) Woman's Place: Options and Limits in Professional Careers. Los Angeles: University of California.

Ferris, Peter (1976) "The Part-Time Instructor in the Los Rios District: An Analysis." ERIC Document JC 76 204.

Frankel, Joanne (1973) "Junior College Faculty Job Satisfaction," ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, University of California, Los Angeles.

Garrison, Roger H. (1967) Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges.

Gleazer, Edmund J. (1968) This is the Community College. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

---------- (1972) Project Focus: A Forecast Study of Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Grymes, Robert J. (1976) "A Survey and Analysis of Part-Time Instructors at J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College, Richmond, Virginia."

Holt, Judith and Ellen Levine (1972) Rebirth of Feminism. New York: Quadrangle.

Kelley, Win and Leslie Wilbur (1970) Teaching in the Community-Junior College. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Kuhns, Eileen (1971) "Part-Time Faculty." In Perspectives on the Community-Junior College: Selected Readings, edited by William K. Ogilvie and Max R. Raines. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Lombardi, John (1974) "Faculty Workload," ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 46, University of California, Los Angeles

----------(1975) "Part-Time Faculty in Community Colleges," ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 54, University of California, Los Angeles.

Marsh, John P. and Terry Lamb (1975) "An Introduction to the Part-Time Teaching Situation with Particular Emphasis on Its Impact at Napa Community College." ERIC Document JC 760 358.

Medsker, Leland L. and Dale Tillery (1971) Breaking the Access Barriers. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Mertes, David H. (1975) "Preliminary Report on Statewide Survey of Part-Time Instruction in California's Community Colleges." Sacramento, California: California Community and Junior College Association.

Miller, Richard I. (1974) Evaluating Faculty Performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Office of Educational Services, The Peralta Colleges (1974) "Part-Time Teachers: An Analysis of Adjunct Faculty Staffing and Compensation in the Peralta Community Colleges."

Phair, Tom S. (1971) "A Profile of California Community College Faculty." Sacramento, California: California Community and Junior College Association, ERIC Document 049 760.

---------- (1972) "Staffing Patterns in California Community Colleges: A 1972 Overview." Sacramento, California: California Community and Junior College Association. ERIC Document

070 433.

---------- (1974) "Staffing Patterns in California Community Colleges: A 1974-75 Overview. Sacramento, California: California Community and Junior College Association. ERIC Document 100 445.

Project on the Status and Education of Women (1976) "Part-Time Faculty Employment." Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges.

Rio Hondo College Academic Senate (1975) "Report of the Rio Hondo College Academic Senate Committee on Part-Time Instruction."

Robinson, Lora H. (1973) "Institutional Variation in the Status of Academic Women." In Academic Women on the Move, edited by Alice S. Rossi and Ann Calderwood. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Roby, Pamela (1975) "Structural and Internalized Barriers to Women in Higher Education." In Women: A Feminist Perspective, edited by Jo Freeman. Palo Alto, California: Mayfield.

Ross, Donald M. (1975) "Preliminary Report on Part-Time Faculty." Sacramento, California: California Community College Trustees.

Sandler, Bernice (1972) "Patterns of Discrimination and Discouragement in Higher Education." In New York Commission on Human Rights, Women's Role in Contemporary Society. New York: Avon.

Scully, Malcolm G. (1975) "Part-Time Teachers: Many Are Angry." IX, 16 Chronicle of Higher Education 1.

Tobias, Sheila and Margaret L. Rumbarger (1974) "Full-Status Part-Time Faculty." In Women in Higher Education, edited by W.T. Furniss and Patricia Albjerg Graham. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor (1974) "Twenty Facts on Women Workers." Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 4 1977

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES